



TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Twenty-ninth Session

OFFICIAL RECORDS

1202nd (closing) meeting

Friday, 20 July 1962,
at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea (concluded):</i>	
(i) <i>Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1961;</i>	
(ii) <i>Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962</i>	
<i>Report of the Drafting Committee on New Guinea</i>	131
<i>Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru (concluded):</i>	
(i) <i>Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1961;</i>	
(ii) <i>Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962</i>	
<i>Adoption of the Council's report on the Territory</i>	135
<i>Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962</i>	135
<i>Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly</i>	136
<i>Closure of the session</i>	136

President: Mr. Jonathan B. BINGHAM
(United States of America).

Present:

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Bolivia, China, France, India, New Zealand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representative of the following specialized agency: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of New Guinea (concluded):

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1961 (T/1591, T/L.1044 and Add.1);
- (ii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962 (T/1597 and Add.1)

[Agenda items 3 (d) and 5 (b)]

At the invitation of the President, Mr. McCarthy, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, took a place at the Council table.

REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON NEW GUINEA (T/L.1053)

1. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft conclusions and recommendations which constituted the

annex to the report of the Drafting Committee (T/L.1053) and asked members of the Council whether they wished to examine the annex as a whole or paragraph by paragraph.

2. Mr. HOOD (Australia) felt that a large part of the annex could be examined as a whole, as was often done. However, his delegation would abstain or make reservations on paragraphs 1 to 3 of the annex. Its position with regard to the proposals of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962, and their endorsement by the Council should be regarded in the light of the observations which he and the special representative had made concerning the Administering Authority's plans for constitutional advancement in the Territory. The Administering Authority had appointed two committees of a constitutional character to study and prepare for political and electoral reforms. It had not yet had time to adopt a final position with regard to the Visiting Mission's recommendations but would, of course, consider them very thoroughly.

3. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the comments his delegation had made on the Administering Authority's report and on the Visiting Mission's recommendations applied equally to the report of the Drafting Committee. The main shortcoming of the last-mentioned report was that it made no provision for the implementation in New Guinea, without delay, of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)). It dealt with the establishment of a representative Parliament, but made no provision for the transfer of powers to that body. Consequently his delegation could not support the report as it stood.

4. In order to improve the report, his delegation wished to submit amendments to paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 17 of the annex. In paragraph 1 he proposed that the word "notes" should be replaced by the word "endorses". In paragraph 2, the words "notes that the Mission believes" should be replaced by the words "approves the view of the Mission". His delegation also had a reservation to make on that paragraph: it could not accept the time-limit specified; it considered that the parliament should be established much sooner. In paragraph 3, the words "gives serious consideration to" should be replaced by the word "implement". The purpose of those amendments was to strengthen the recommendations, which did not go far enough and might have no effect. In paragraph 17, he would replace the phrase "for the rapid and planned advance of the Territory in all aspects of its political life" by the phrase "for the implementation, without delay, in New Guinea of the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples". He considered that an essential amendment, for the Trusteeship Council had to report to the General Assembly on the steps it had taken to implement the Declaration and should recommend the Adminis-

tering Authority to take measures to that end as a matter of urgency.

5. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) regretted that the USSR representative should have taken a completely theoretical attitude which disregarded the particular difficulties of the situation. The Visiting Mission had recommended practical and immediate steps in the direction of self-government and independence for the Trust Territory and in the circumstances it was hardly feasible to recommend, in the same breath, immediate implementation of the Declaration. Consequently he saw no need for the proposed amendments to paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, or for that to paragraph 17, which, once again, was unduly theoretical.

6. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the hope that, despite the opposition he had voiced, the United Kingdom representative would be able to support some of his amendments, which related not to substance but to procedure. So far from adopting a theoretical attitude, his delegation regarded the Declaration as an eminently practical instrument, and its position, especially on the amendment to paragraph 17, was no more than justice demanded. The attitude of the United Kingdom delegation was inconsistent with the Declaration, since that delegation refused to agree to the practical application of the provisions of the Declaration to New Guinea and Nauru. The Declaration had become an important moral weapon in the struggle of the colonial peoples; that explained the hostility of the colonial Powers. At all events it was the Trusteeship Council's duty to ensure that it was implemented. In that spirit his delegation had submitted its amendments.

7. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) asked the USSR representative to whom the powers would be transferred, if they were to be transferred, in the immediate future. Purely on technical grounds, a year seemed to him the minimum period in which a truly representative parliament could be formed in New Guinea. The Council's concern was to make the time-limit as realistic as possible. Consequently since paragraph 17 already mentioned General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the urgency of advancement, he saw no need for a further reference to immediate implementation.

8. The Administering Authority had already expressed reservations on the passages to which the Soviet Union had submitted amendments. If it accepted 1963 as the target date for the recommendations, then, having regard to the inherent difficulties of the Territory and the problems it presented, compliance with that time-limit would demand its utmost efforts.

9. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained the USSR amendment to paragraph 17 again in order to dispel any confusion; he wished it to be clear that his delegation was asking for the implementation of the Declaration without delay, without any procrastination. In that spirit, the Council was to recommend the Administering Authority to establish definite dates reflecting the sense of urgency with regard to the implementation of the Declaration referred to in the Drafting Committee's report. The purpose of the Soviet amendment was to make it clear that the Council would brook no delay or procrastination on the Administering Authority's part. First of all, the Administering Authority must take steps without delay to establish a truly representative parliament. The purpose of the USSR amendment to para-

graph 17 was to state in specific terms the problem of the transfer of powers under paragraph 5 of the Declaration. Paragraph 1 of the annex to the Drafting Committee's report referred to the establishment of a parliament. Thus the Soviet amendment to paragraph 17 complemented paragraph 1 by providing for the transfer of powers to the organ that would be established. Any difference of opinion among representatives with regard to the target dates was a separate problem which should be distinguished from the problem just raised.

10. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that he and other members of the Council would have no objection to the replacement of the word "notes", in paragraph 1, by the word "endorses". On the other hand, the Soviet amendment to paragraph 17 raised a point of law on which he disagreed with the USSR representative. The fact was that the value of any Council resolution was enhanced when it was endorsed by the Administering Authority: it thereupon virtually became law. If the Council used the words "without delay" and the Australian delegation said that it had no instructions from its Government and did not know what the latter would ultimately decide, it could not be assumed that, even if the Administering Authority appreciated the soundness of the Council's recommendations, it would act on them. The words "without delay" would remain a dead letter unless the Administering Authority accepted the Council's decision embodying them. It was to be hoped that, when the matter came before the Fourth Committee again, the Australian Government would be in a position to specify its position frankly on that important problem, which had been stated in the Council with the utmost clarity.

11. Mr. KIDWAI (India) felt that the words "give serious consideration to" in paragraph 3 were unduly weak by comparison with the Visiting Mission's recommendations; the amendment proposed by the Soviet representative was accordingly satisfactory to his delegation. In the same paragraph, he proposed that the word "proposal" should be replaced by the word "recommendation", which seemed to him more accurate.

12. As to paragraph 17, the Visiting Mission had stated (T/1597, para. 267) that rapid and sound progress towards "the accepted goal of self-government or independence" could be made only if three prerequisites were met, and had recommended (T/1597, para. 269) that the target for the implementation of the three plans should be set no later than 31 December 1963. Thus the Mission's report contained a clear reference to the "goal of self-government" which was not reflected in paragraph 17 of the Drafting Committee's conclusions and recommendations. He would therefore like to see the closing words of paragraph 17 amended in order to reflect the Mission's recommendations more accurately; he accordingly supported the USSR amendment to that paragraph.

13. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) asked the Indian representative to state exactly what changes he wished to introduce in paragraph 17. That representative had referred to the paragraph in the Visiting Mission's report in which the three conditions for progress towards the goal of self-government or independence were enumerated: namely, an increase in skilled personnel, a thorough economic survey and the establishment of a parliament. Those conditions complemented one another, but the first two could not be fulfilled as soon as the third; they would create

fresh problems, and were not prerequisites for independence.

14. Mr. KIDWAI (India) explained that his objection to paragraph 17 of the Drafting Committee's report was that it did not mention the accepted goal of self-government or independence. As the Soviet representative had pointed out, the paragraph referred only to "the rapid and planned advance of the Territory in all aspects of its political life"; the USSR amendment made good that omission, and the Indian delegation would accordingly support it.

15. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should vote on the amendments then on the paragraphs to which they related, and lastly on the draft conclusions and recommendations as a whole.

16. Mr. HOOD (Australia) requested that the vote should be taken paragraph by paragraph.

17. With regard to paragraphs 1 to 3, he had a comment to make on the use of the term "parliament". He wondered whether the members of the Drafting Committee had had some particular reason for using that term. Moreover the expression "Parliament of Papua and New Guinea" appeared to predetermine a nomenclature which had not yet been decided, for it was not yet known what name the indigenous population would ultimately choose for the Territory. Furthermore, in the case of other Trust Territories in process of attaining self-government, the Council had used, not the term "parliament", but such terms as "legislative assembly", "representative assembly" or "central assembly". He would be interested to know why a different course had been followed in the present case.

18. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) replied that the same question had come up in the Drafting Committee, which had noted the Visiting Mission's use at various times of the word "parliament". The Mission had had in mind a representative parliament from which a government could eventually emerge. That interpretation of the word was in keeping with British tradition and implied that, as soon as a parliament was formed, political authority came into being.

19. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) observed that the Drafting Committee's report was based on, and in large measure a summary of, the Visiting Mission's report. The word "parliament" appeared a number of times, and possibly with different meanings, in the Mission's report, which stated in paragraph 218 that the three main proposals put forward by the Mission would "constitute a most important step towards the development of the full parliamentary system". The Drafting Committee had merely adopted the term used by the Visiting Mission. As he understood the word "parliament", it was a generic term indicating a big enough framework for the development, within that framework, of whatever kind of legislature might be found by the people of New Guinea to be best suited to their needs.

20. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) said that the Visiting Mission had never had any intention of imposing a particular term on the people of New Guinea. The choice was obviously one for the people themselves to make in consultation with the Administering Authority.

21. Mr. KIANG (China) suggested that the word "legislature" should be used in place of the word "parliament".

22. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) explained that, by using the words "Parliament of Papua and New Guinea", the Mission had merely sought to indicate that parliamentary institutions should not be confined to the Trust Territory itself. With regard to the Chinese representative's suggestion, he felt that the word "parliament" was preferable from the historical point of view, since it implied that the Territory would eventually have a government of its own.

23. Mr. NUCKER (United States of America) said that, after using the term "house of representatives", the Visiting Mission had noted that the word "parliament" was more familiar to both the New Guineans and the Australians; that was probably why it had been adopted. The Visiting Mission had certainly had no desire to predetermine the meaning of the word "parliament" or the future operation of such a body.

24. Mr. KIANG (China) said that, if the Australian Government had no objection to the use of the word "parliament", he would agree to it himself.

25. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet amendment proposing the replacement of the word "notes" in paragraph 1 by the word "endorses".

The amendment was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

26. The PRESIDENT put paragraph 1 as amended, to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Bolivia, China, France, India, New Zealand.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia.

Paragraph 1, as amended, was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

27. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet amendment proposing the replacement of the words "notes that the Mission believes" in paragraph 2 by the words "approves the view of the Mission".

The amendment was adopted by 5 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

28. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet amendment proposing the substitution of the word "implement" for the words "give serious consideration to" in paragraph 3.

There were 2 votes in favour, 2 against and 4 abstentions.

29. The PRESIDENT said that, under rule 38 of the rules of procedure, there would be a brief recess before the voting continued.

30. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that he was prepared to vote for the Soviet amendment. He had abstained because the amendment did not appear to alter the meaning of the paragraph in any fundamental way.

The meeting was suspended at 12.25 p.m. and resumed at 12.35 p.m.

31. The PRESIDENT said that a vote by roll-call on the Soviet amendment to paragraph 3 had been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

France, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bolivia.

Against: New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia.

Abstaining: France, China.

The Soviet amendment was rejected by 4 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

32. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Indian amendment proposing the substitution of the word "recommendation" for the word "proposal" in paragraph 3.

The amendment was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 7 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 7 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

33. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Visiting Mission's recommendation that the main road linking Lae and Goroka should be put in good order—a recommendation repeated in paragraph 10 of the annex to the Drafting Committee's report—was the reflection of the wishes expressed by the people or by the Legislative Council; or had it been introduced only by the Mission, which had been greatly inconvenienced by the very bad roads in the Territory.

34. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) observed that the Council had had time to discuss the Drafting Committee's report before it was put to the vote.

35. The PRESIDENT said that the normal procedure was that there should be no discussion after the start of the voting. The Council would have to decide whether it wished to make an exception in the present case.

36. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the President had permitted the representative of New Zealand to open a technical discussion on paragraph 1 of the annex.

37. The PRESIDENT replied that the discussion referred to had taken place before the start of the voting.

38. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the voting on paragraph 10 had not yet started.

39. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) proposed that one of the members of the Drafting Committee should be authorized to reply to the Soviet representative's question and that the Council should then vote on

the other paragraphs of the annex without further discussion.

40. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the proposal was arbitrary since it was intended to limit, without any justification, the right to speak. The Council should either prohibit all discussion or grant the same rights to all delegations. He noted that the representatives of colonial Powers resorted to anti-democratic methods in order to stifle the discussion.

The United Kingdom proposal was adopted by 4 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

41. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia), recalling the difficulties caused by the inadequacy of the Territory's means of communication, expressed regret that the matter had not been raised earlier. He drew attention to the Mission's recommendation that the next main road to be put in good order should be the one linking Lae and Goroka; and to the Mission's view that, once the road was established, development would quickly follow in the Highlands and along the road as well (T/1597, para. 175). Since it was a question of providing the 500,000 inhabitants of the Highlands with means of communicating with the rest of the Territory, the problem was a very important one; that was what had motivated the Visiting Mission's recommendation. The Mission had taken the matter up with the Administering Authority, which had indicated its willingness to undertake the necessary work.

Paragraph 10 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 11 was adopted by 8 votes to 1.

Paragraph 12 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 13 was adopted by 8 votes to none.

Paragraph 14 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 15 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 16 was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

42. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Soviet amendment proposing the replacement of the words "for the rapid and planned advance of the territory in all aspects of its political life", in paragraph 17, by the words "for the implementation, without delay, in New Guinea of the provisions of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples".

A vote was taken by roll-call.

India, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Australia, France, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bolivia, China.

The amendment was rejected by 5 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

43. The PRESIDENT put paragraph 17 to the vote.

Paragraph 17 was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

44. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the recommendation in paragraph 4 of the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.1053), to the effect that the working paper on conditions in New Guinea prepared by the Secretariat (T/L.1044 and Add.1) should be used as the basic text for the chapter on that Territory in the Council's report to the General Assembly.

That recommendation was adopted by 6 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

45. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) explained that his delegation had not intervened in the general discussion on New Guinea because its views coincided with those expressed in the Visiting Mission's report. However, it had replied to the criticisms voiced by the representative of the Soviet Union. It wished the Secretariat to include those replies among the observations of members of the Council representing their individual opinions only.

46. The PRESIDENT said that he had been advised by the Secretariat that it had not been possible to circulate to the Council the text of the observations of members representing their individual opinions in connexion with New Guinea. He suggested that each delegation should transmit the text of its observations to the Secretariat, which would include them in the chapter on New Guinea under the relevant headings.

It was so decided.

47. The PRESIDENT then put the chapter on New Guinea to the vote as a whole.

The chapter on New Guinea, as a whole, was adopted by 7 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

48. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom) explained, with regard to his vote on the conclusions and recommendations in the annex to the Drafting Committee's report (T/L.1053), that he would have preferred the text of paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 as proposed by the Drafting Committee.

49. Mr. DOISE (France) wished to explain his vote on the amendments proposed by the Soviet Union.

50. The French delegation had not been able to vote for the amendment to paragraph 3 because it had felt that, in order to make a decision, the Council would have to know the Administering Authority's reply to the Visiting Mission's recommendations. For very understandable reasons that reply had not yet been received.

51. The French delegation had also been unable to support the amendment to paragraph 17 for reasons which it had explained on many occasions. As each case arose, the French delegation always voted in the light of the realities of the case rather than of a decision or resolution of the United Nations.

52. His delegation had abstained from voting on paragraph 10 in consideration of the fact that the matter of the road from Lae to Garoka had not been discussed in the general debate. There was a tradition in the Council that recommendations adopted at the end of a debate should represent a kind of summary of opinions on which there had been agreement during the general debate.

53. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) said that he had abstained from voting on paragraph 17 or on the Soviet amendment thereto because he had considered that reference to the "urgency" of the problem, as in the Drafting Committee's text, would be sufficient to

convince the Administering Authority to accept the Council's recommendations.

54. Mr. KIDWAI (India) said that, although his delegation had voted for paragraph 3, it wished to go on record as considering that the words "give serious consideration to the Mission's proposal" seemed rather weak. It still thought that it would have been better to say that the Administering Authority should implement that proposal.

55. The Indian delegation had abstained from voting on paragraph 17 because it did not mention the ultimate goal of independence, which was a very important matter.

56. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not been able to vote for the report on New Guinea as a whole, because it did not provide for any effective measures to expedite the Territory's accession to independence. His delegation considered that to constitute further evidence of the fact that the Trusteeship Council, the majority of whose members were representatives of colonial Powers, was incapable of implementing the General Assembly's decision concerning the liquidation of colonialism, including the Trusteeship System, which was merely a form of colonialism.

Mr. McCarthy, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of New Guinea, withdrew.

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of Nauru (concluded):

- (i) Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1961 (T/1589, T/1599, T/L.1039 and Add.1);
- (ii) Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962 (T/1595 and Add.1)

[Agenda items 3 (c) and 5 (a)]

ADOPTION OF THE COUNCIL'S REPORT ON THE TERRITORY (T/L.1052)

57. The PRESIDENT drew attention to document T/L.1052, containing a summary of the observations of members of the Council representing their individual opinions only. As he assumed that the text of their observations had already been approved by the members concerned, he suggested that it should be approved by the Council for inclusion in the chapter on Nauru in its report to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

58. The PRESIDENT then put to the vote the chapter on Nauru as a whole, consisting of the text adopted at the previous meeting and the observations just approved.

The chapter on Nauru as a whole was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Reports of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru and New Guinea, 1962 (T/1595 and Add.1, T/1597 and Add.1, T/L.1050)

[Agenda item 5]

59. The PRESIDENT put the draft resolution submitted by China (T/L.1050) to the vote.

The draft resolution (T/L.1050) was adopted by 8 votes to none.

Adoption of report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly (T/L.1048 and Add.1)

[Agenda item 12]

60. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would abstain in the vote on the draft report of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly (T/L.1048 and Add.1), as a whole, for the reasons which he had already explained when the various parts of the report were being considered.

61. With regard to the chapter on the examination of petitions, he felt that, as it stood, that chapter did not show in what manner the petitions had been considered by the Council: at the current session they had been considered by the Trusteeship Council and not by the Standing Committee on Petitions. The chapter should reflect not only the statements of the Special Representative of the Administering Authority but also the exchanges of views that had taken place in the Council.

62. Mr. RAPOPORT (Secretary of the Council) admitted that the Standing Committee on Petitions had in the past produced more detailed reports. But the report prepared by the Secretariat contained footnotes referring to the records of the meetings of the Council at which the petitions had been discussed. If the Council wished the Secretariat to modify its draft report, it would have to approve the amendments that would be made.

63. The PRESIDENT suggested that the work should be left to the Secretariat, subject to the approval of the President and Vice-President.

64. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed to that proposal on condition that the Secretariat should carry out the necessary consultations with the delegations before asking the President and Vice-President to approve the new text.

It was so decided.

65. The PRESIDENT put the draft report of the Trusteeship Council (T/L.1048 and Add.1) to the vote, subject to those reservations:

The draft report (T/L.1048 and Add.1) was adopted by 8 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Closure of the session

66. The PRESIDENT recalled that the terms of Bolivia and India would expire at the end of 1962. He expressed the Council's appreciation to the delegations of both countries for the work that they had done as members of the Council and of visiting missions.

67. He thanked the Vice-President, the other members of the Council, the Under-Secretary and the Secretariat staff for their co-operation during the session.

68. Mr. SALAMANCA (Bolivia) thanked the President for his kind words. In the course of his visits to Trust Territories as a member of visiting missions, he had acquired a deep feeling of sympathy for the inhabitants.

He had been happy to be able to help in the search for constructive solutions for promoting the advancement of those Territories. In the Council he had represented not only his country but an entire region. He hoped he had made a useful contribution in that capacity.

69. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted to have to draw the Council's attention to a statement made by Mr. Bingham, the President of the Trusteeship Council, at the University of Nebraska on 19 July. That statement contained passages which distorted the position of the Soviet Union both within and outside the United Nations, and included groundless assertions with regard to the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. It was particularly regrettable that Mr. Bingham should have made that statement not only as the representative of the United States but also as the President of the Trusteeship Council, as was indicated by the Press release. The delegation of the Soviet Union had wished to draw the attention of the Fourth Committee to a similar case earlier, namely a statement made by the President during a United States television broadcast in February 1962, in the course of which he had also referred to his title of President of the Trusteeship Council; but it had subsequently decided to refrain from doing so. During that television programme, the President had alleged that the delegation of the Soviet Union was not listened to in the Trusteeship Council, and that everybody fell asleep when the Soviet representative spoke. That of course was not true. It was because the President of the Trusteeship Council repeatedly made statements in his capacity as such that the Soviet delegation had raised the issue, for it wished to avoid such incidents in the future.

70. He expressed his appreciation to the delegations of non-administering Powers which were members of the Council. It was unfortunate that the representatives of anti-colonialist countries were too few in number in the Council to be able to exert any real influence. He regretted that India and Bolivia were leaving the Council, for on 1 January 1963 only one non-administering State would be elected to the Council by the General Assembly, so that the unsatisfactory situation in the Council would only grow worse.

71. However that state of affairs also showed that the situation was changing, that the colonial régime was falling apart and that the role of the Trusteeship Council was diminishing even more. The Trusteeship System and the Council were fated to disappear from the international scene. Such an event would be no cause for regret, for the liquidation of the Trusteeship System would mean that the purpose assigned to the Trusteeship Council under the United Nations Charter had been achieved.

72. Mr. KIANG (China) proposed that the members of the Council should rise as an expression of their gratitude to the President and Vice-President.

73. The PRESIDENT took no formal cognizance of the proposal and declared closed the twenty-ninth session of the Trusteeship Council.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.